arXiv:1611.09081v1 [nlin.SI] 28 Nov 2016

Ultradiscrete Permanent Solution to the Ultradiscrete KP Equation

Hidetomo Nagai*

November 29, 2016

Abstract

We propose an ultradiscrete permanent solution to the ultradiscrete KP equation. The ultradiscrete permanent is an ultradiscrete analogue of the usual permanent. The elements on this ultradiscrete permanent solution are required some additional relations other than the ultradiscrete dispersion relation. We confirm the solution satisfying these relations and propose some explicit examples of the solution.

1 Introduction

Soliton equations are known as the ones possessing exact solutions, infinite conserved quantities and so on. These solutions are generally expressed by the determinant in the form such as Wronskian, Grammian. For such types of these solutions, its equations are transformed into the identity of determinants of which elements obey the dispersion relations. One of the most fundamental soliton equations is the discrete KP equation[1, 2], which is expressed by

$$\begin{aligned} &A_1(A_2-A_3)T(l+1,m,n)T(l,m+1,n+1)\\ &+A_2(A_3-A_1)T(l,m+1,n)T(l+1,m,n+1)\\ &+A_3(A_1-A_2)T(l,m,n+1)T(l+1,m+1,n)=0, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where l, m, n are independent variables and A_1, A_2, A_3 are arbitrary parameters. It is well known the discrete KP equation (1) admits determinant solution[3].

$$T(l,m,n)=\det\begin{bmatrix} \Phi_1(0) & \Phi_1(1) & \cdots & \Phi_1(N-1)\\ \Phi_2(0) & \Phi_2(1) & \cdots & \Phi_2(N-1)\\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots\\ \Phi_N(0) & \Phi_N(1) & \cdots & \Phi_N(N-1) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{2}$$

where $\Phi_i(s)=\Phi(l,m,n,s)$ satisfies the following dispersion relations,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_i(l+1,m,n,s)&=\Phi_i(l,m,n,s)+A_1\Phi_i(l,m,n,s+1),\\ \Phi_i(l,m+1,n,s)&=\Phi_i(l,m,n,s)+A_2\Phi_i(l,m,n,s+1),\\ \Phi_i(l,m,n+1,s)&=\Phi_i(l,m,n,s)+A_3\Phi_i(l,m,n,s+1), \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

*Department of Mathematics, Tokai University, 4-1-1, Kitakaname, Hiratsuka, Kanagawa, 259-1292, Japan. E-mail: hdnagai@tokai-u.jp

for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$. For example, the soliton solution can be obtained by setting

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_i(l,m,n,s) =& P_i^s(1+A_1P_i)^l(1+A_2P_i)^m(1+A_3P_i)^nC_i \\ &+ (-1)^{i+1}P_i^{-s}(1+A_1P_i)^{-l}(1+A_2P_i)^{-m}(1+A_3P_i)^{-n}C_i',\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where P_i and C_i, C_i' are arbitrary parameters. In fact, the function (4) satisfies (3). In addition, another solution also can be obtained by setting

$$\begin{bmatrix}\Phi_1(s)\\ \Phi_2(s)\\ \vdots \\ \Phi_N(s)\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}C_{11} & C_{12} & \ldots & C_{1M}\\ C_{21} & C_{22} & \ldots & C_{2M}\\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ C_{N1} & C_{N2} & \ldots & C_{NM}\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}P_1^s(1+A_1P_1)^l(1+A_2P_1)^m(1+A_3P_1)^nC_1\\ P_2^s(1+A_1P_2)^l(1+A_2P_2)^m(1+A_3P_2)^nC_2\\ \vdots \\ P_M^s(1+A_1P_M)^l(1+A_2P_M)^m(1+A_3P_M)^nC_M\end{bmatrix}, \tag{5}$$

where P_i, C_{ij} are arbitrary parameters and M is any positive integer. Note that the dispersion relations (3) are general conditions to the solution (2), and the functions (4) and (5) are only the specific realization of (3).

Ultradiscretization is a limiting procedure[4]. By applying the ultradiscretization to the discrete KP equation, we can obtain the ultradiscrete KP(uKP) equation as below. Introducing transformations $T(l,m,n) = e^{\tau(l,m,n)/\varepsilon}$, $A_i = e^{-a_i/\varepsilon}$ with a positive parameter ε, then (1) is expressed by

$$\begin{aligned}&e^{(\tau(l+1,m,n)+\tau(l,m+1,n+1)-a_1-a_2)/\varepsilon} + e^{(\tau(l,m+1,n)+\tau(l+1,m,n+1)-a_2-a_3)/\varepsilon}\\ &+ e^{(\tau(l,m,n+1)+\tau(l+1,m+1,n)-a_3-a_1)/\varepsilon}\\ =&e^{(\tau(l+1,m,n)+\tau(l,m+1,n+1)-a_1-a_3)/\varepsilon} + e^{(\tau(l,m+1,n)+\tau(l+1,m,n+1)-a_2-a_1)/\varepsilon}\\ &+ e^{(\tau(l,m,n+1)+\tau(l+1,m+1,n)-a_2-a_3)/\varepsilon}.\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Applying $\varepsilon \log$ both sides and taking a limit $\varepsilon \to +0$, we obtain the uKP equation.

$$\begin{aligned}&\max(\tau(l+1,m,n)+\tau(l,m+1,n+1)-a_1-a_2,\\ &\quad \tau(l,m+1,n)+\tau(l+1,m,n+1)-a_2-a_3,\\ &\quad \tau(l,m,n+1)+\tau(l+1,m+1,n)-a_1-a_3)\\ =&\max(\tau(l+1,m,n)+\tau(l,m+1,n+1)-a_1-a_3,\\ &\quad \tau(l,m+1,n)+\tau(l+1,m,n+1)-a_1-a_2,\\ &\quad \tau(l,m,n+1)+\tau(l+1,m+1,n)-a_2-a_3),\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

by using a key formula

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to+0}\varepsilon\log(e^{a_1/\varepsilon}+e^{a_2/\varepsilon}+\cdots+e^{a_n/\varepsilon}) = \max(a_1,a_2,\ldots,a_n). \tag{8}$$

Equivalently, (7) is rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}&\tau(l,m+1,n)+\tau(l+1,m,n+1),\\ =&\max\big(\tau(l+1,m,n)+\tau(l,m+1,n+1)-a_1+a_2, \tau(l,m,n+1)+\tau(l+1,m+1,n)\big)\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

under the assumption $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq a_3$ without a loss of generality. We also obtain a solution to (9) if we can ultradiscretize (2) and (3) straightforwardly. However, the expression of sum of positive terms is required in order to apply the key formula (8). For this reason it is difficult to ultradiscretize determinant solution directly. To avoid this problem, we introduce ultradiscrete permanent[5]. The ultradiscrete permanent(UP) of $N \times N$ matrix $A = [a_{ij}]$ is defined as

$$\mathrm{up}[A] \equiv \max_{\pi}(a_{1\pi_1} + a_{2\pi_2} + \cdots + a_{N\pi_N}), \tag{10}$$

where $\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_N)$ is a set of all possible permutations of $\{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$. Note that the UP is directly defined by ultradiscretizing a permanent by using (8). We proposed an UP solution to (9) in the previous paper[6]. It is an ultradiscrete analogue of (2) associated with (4). Also soliton solutions to the ultradiscrete KdV equation, the ultradiscrete Toda equation, the ultradiscrete hungry Lotka-Volterra equation are expressed by the UP form[5, 7, 8]. These facts suggest UP is an ultradiscrete analogue of determinant. However, the above solutions are ultradiscrete analogues of the soliton solutions, and UP solution such as determinant solution associated with dispersion relations is not obtained yet.

In this paper, we propose an UP solution to the uKP equation. The solution is an ultradiscrete analogue of (2) associated with (3). Note that we shall impose some additional conditions on the elements of UP to satisfy the uKP equation. Moreover, we show some explicit elements which are ultradiscrete analogues of (4) and (5), and confirm they obey these conditions. This paper is consists on below. First, we give some properties of ultradiscrete permanent in section 2. In section 3, we give an UP solution to the uKP equation. In section 4, we propose some explicit examples of the solution. Finally, we give concluding remarks in section 5.

2 Properties of Ultradiscrete Permanent

Let N be a positive integer. Consider an UP of $N \times N$ matrix $A = [a_{ij}]$. Then one can derive the following properties from the definition.

$$\mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & \ldots & a_{1i} & \ldots & a_{1j} & \ldots & a_{1N} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{N1} & \ldots & a_{Ni} & \ldots & a_{Nj} & \ldots & a_{NN} \end{bmatrix} = \mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & \ldots & a_{1j} & \ldots & a_{1i} & \ldots & a_{1N} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{N1} & \ldots & a_{Nj} & \ldots & a_{Ni} & \ldots & a_{NN} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{11}$$

$$c + \mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & \ldots & a_{1i} & \ldots & a_{1N} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{N1} & \ldots & a_{Ni} & \ldots & a_{NN} \end{bmatrix} = \mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & \ldots & c + a_{1i} & \ldots & a_{1N} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{N1} & \ldots & c + a_{Ni} & \ldots & a_{NN} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{12}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & \ldots & \max(a_{1i}, b_1) & \ldots & a_{1N} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{N1} & \ldots & \max(a_{Ni}, b_N) & \ldots & a_{NN} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \max\left(\mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & \ldots & a_{1i} & \ldots & a_{1N} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{N1} & \ldots & a_{Ni} & \ldots & a_{NN} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & \ldots & b_1 & \ldots & a_{1N} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{N1} & \ldots & b_N & \ldots & a_{NN} \end{bmatrix} \right) \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

for $i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, N$. Moreover, we give two propositions.

Proposition 2.1 *Let N, M be positive integers, and $B = [b_{ij}]$, $C = [c_{ij}]$ an $N \times M$ matrix and an $M \times N$ matrix respectively. Define ultradiscrete product of B and C as*

$$B \otimes C = [\max_{1 \le k \le M} (b_{ik} + c_{kj})]_{1 \le i,j \le N}. \tag{14}$$

Then,

$$\mathrm{up}[B \otimes C] = \max_{1 \le j_1 \le \cdots \le j_N \le M} \left(\mathrm{up}[B]^{1 \ldots N}_{j_1 \ldots j_N} + \mathrm{up}[C]^{j_1 \ldots j_N}_{1 \ldots N} \right) \tag{15}$$

holds. Here $\mathrm{up}[B]^{1 \cdots N}_{j_1 \cdots j_N}$ denotes the minor UP of the matrix whose rows and columns are the those of B at $1 \ldots N$ and $j_1 \ldots j_N$ respectively.

Proposition 2.2 *Let $\boldsymbol{a}$, $\boldsymbol{b}$, $\boldsymbol{c}$ be arbitrary N-dimensional vectors. Define $N \times N$ matrix $D_{l,m,n}$ as*

$$D_{l,m,n} = [\boldsymbol{a} \cdots \boldsymbol{a}\ \boldsymbol{b} \cdots \boldsymbol{b}\ \boldsymbol{c} \cdots \boldsymbol{c}],$$

where l, m, n denote numbers of the columns of $\boldsymbol{a}$, $\boldsymbol{b}$, $\boldsymbol{c}$ respectively. If

$$l + m + n = l' + m' + n' = N, \quad 0 \le l < l', \quad 0 \le m' < m,$$

then

$$\mathrm{up}[D_{l,m,n}] + \mathrm{up}[D_{l',m',n'}] \le \mathrm{up}[D_{l+1,m-1,n}] + \mathrm{up}[D_{l'-1,m'+1,n'}] \tag{16}$$

holds.

Proofs of Propositions are given in appendix.

3 UP Solution to the Ultradiscrete KP Equation

In this section, we give the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1 *Let $\tau(l,m,n)$ be*

$$\tau(l,m,n) = \mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1(0) & \varphi_1(1) & \cdots & \varphi_1(N-1) \\ \varphi_2(0) & \varphi_2(1) & \cdots & \varphi_2(N-1) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \varphi_N(0) & \varphi_N(1) & \cdots & \varphi_N(N-1) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{17}$$

where $\varphi_i(s) = \varphi_i(l,m,n,s)$ is a function depends on l, m, n and s. Suppose $\varphi_i(l,m,n,s)$ satisfies the following conditions.

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_i(l+1,m,n,s) &= \max(\varphi_i(l,m,n,s), \varphi_i(l,m,n,s+1) - a_1), \\ \varphi_i(l,m+1,n,s) &= \max(\varphi_i(l,m,n,s), \varphi_i(l,m,n,s+1) - a_2), \\ \varphi_i(l,m,n+1,s) &= \max(\varphi_i(l,m,n,s), \varphi_i(l,m,n,s+1) - a_3), \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

$$\varphi_{i_1}(s) + \varphi_{i_2}(s) \le \max\big(\varphi_{i_1}(s-1) + \varphi_{i_2}(s+1), \varphi_{i_2}(s-1) + \varphi_{i_1}(s+1)\big) \tag{19}$$

for $1 \le i, i_1, i_2 \le N$, and

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0) \cdots \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_2)} \cdots \boldsymbol{\varphi}(N)] + \mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0) \cdots \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_1)} \cdots \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_3)} \cdots \boldsymbol{\varphi}(N+1)] \\ &= \max\Big(\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0) \cdots \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_3)} \cdots \boldsymbol{\varphi}(N)] + \mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0) \cdots \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_1)} \cdots \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_2)} \cdots \boldsymbol{\varphi}(N+1)], \\ &\qquad \mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0) \cdots \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_1)} \cdots \boldsymbol{\varphi}(N)] + \mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0) \cdots \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_2)} \cdots \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_3)} \cdots \boldsymbol{\varphi}(N+1)]\Big), \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

for $0 \le k_1 < k_2 < k_3 \le N$. Here $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(s)$ denotes

$$\boldsymbol{\varphi}(s) = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1(s) \\ \varphi_2(s) \\ \vdots \\ \varphi_N(s) \end{bmatrix}$$

and the symbol $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(s)}$ means that $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(s)$ is omitted. Then $\tau(l,m,n)$ satisfies (9).

Note that (18) is ultradiscrete analogue of (3). Both (19) and (20) are additional conditions to satisfy the uKP equation (9). Theorem 3.1 is proved by the similar manner given in [6]. Thus we show the outline in the case of $N = 2$.

Using condition (18) and the properties (12), (13), we can expand $\tau(l+1,m,n)$ as following.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tau(l+1,m,n)\\
=&\mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix}\varphi_1(l+1,m,n,0) & \varphi_1(l+1,m,n,1)\\ \varphi_2(l+1,m,n,0) & \varphi_2(l+1,m,n,1)\end{bmatrix}\\
=&\mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix}\max(\varphi_1(0),\varphi_1(1)-a_1) & \max(\varphi_1(1),\varphi_1(2)-a_1)\\ \max(\varphi_2(0),\varphi_2(1)-a_1) & \max(\varphi_2(1),\varphi_2(2)-a_1)\end{bmatrix}\\
=&\max\Big(\mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix}\varphi_1(0) & \varphi_1(1)\\ \varphi_2(0) & \varphi_2(1)\end{bmatrix},\mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix}\varphi_1(1) & \varphi_1(1)\\ \varphi_2(1) & \varphi_2(1)\end{bmatrix}-a_1,\mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix}\varphi_1(0) & \varphi_1(2)\\ \varphi_2(0) & \varphi_2(2)\end{bmatrix}-a_1,\mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix}\varphi_1(1) & \varphi_1(2)\\ \varphi_2(1) & \varphi_2(2)\end{bmatrix}-2a_1\Big).
\end{aligned}\tag{21}$$

Moreover, since condition (19) gives the inequality

$$\mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix}\varphi_1(s) & \varphi_1(s)\\ \varphi_2(s) & \varphi_2(s)\end{bmatrix}\le\mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix}\varphi_1(s-1) & \varphi_1(s+1)\\ \varphi_2(s-1) & \varphi_2(s+1)\end{bmatrix},\tag{22}$$

thus we obtain

$$\tau(l+1,m,n)=\max\Big(\mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix}\varphi_1(0) & \varphi_1(1)\\ \varphi_2(0) & \varphi_2(1)\end{bmatrix},\mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix}\varphi_1(0) & \varphi_1(2)\\ \varphi_2(0) & \varphi_2(2)\end{bmatrix}-a_1,\mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix}\varphi_1(1) & \varphi_1(2)\\ \varphi_2(1) & \varphi_2(2)\end{bmatrix}-2a_1\Big).\tag{23}$$

We also obtain the similar expressions of $\tau(l,m+1,n)$, $\tau(l,m,n+1)$, $\tau(l+1,m+1,n)$, $\tau(l+1,m,n+1)$, $\tau(l,m+1,n+1)$. Substituting these expressions into LHS of (9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tau(l,m+1,n)+\tau(l+1,m,n+1)\\
=&\max\big(\mathrm{up}[0\ 1],\mathrm{up}[0\ 2]-a_2,\mathrm{up}[1\ 2]-2a_2\big)\\
+&\max\big(\mathrm{up}[0\ 1],\mathrm{up}[0\ 2]-a_3,\mathrm{up}[0\ 3]-a_1-a_3,\mathrm{up}[1\ 2]-2a_3,\mathrm{up}[1\ 3]-a_1-2a_3,\mathrm{up}[2\ 3]-2a_1-2a_3\big).
\end{aligned}\tag{24}$$

Here $[i\ j]$ denotes

$$[i\ j]=\begin{bmatrix}\varphi_1(i) & \varphi_1(j)\\ \varphi_2(i) & \varphi_2(j)\end{bmatrix}.\tag{25}$$

On the other hand, RHS of (9) is expressed by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max(\tau(l+1,m,n)+\tau(l,m+1,n+1)-a_1+a_2,\tau(l,m,n+1)+\tau(l+1,m+1,n))\\
=&\max\Big(\max\big(\mathrm{up}[0\ 1]-a_1,\mathrm{up}[0\ 2]-2a_1,\mathrm{up}[1\ 2]-3a_1\big)+\max\big(\mathrm{up}[0\ 1]+a_2,\mathrm{up}[0\ 2]+a_2-a_3,\\
&\mathrm{up}[0\ 3]-a_3,\mathrm{up}[1\ 2]+a_2-2a_3,\mathrm{up}[1\ 3]-2a_3,\mathrm{up}[2\ 3]-a_2-2a_3\big),\\
&\max\big(\mathrm{up}[0\ 1],\mathrm{up}[0\ 2]-a_3,\mathrm{up}[1\ 2]-2a_3\big)+\max\big(\mathrm{up}[0\ 1],\mathrm{up}[0\ 2]-a_2,\\
&\mathrm{up}[0\ 3]-a_1-a_2,\mathrm{up}[1\ 2]-2a_2,\mathrm{up}[1\ 3]-a_1-2a_2,\mathrm{up}[2\ 3]-2a_1-2a_2\big)\Big).
\end{aligned}\tag{26}$$

We can check the arguments which have the same coefficients of a_1, a_2, a_3 in (24) and (26) correspond respectively due to condition (20). For example, the argument which has $-a_1-a_2-2a_3$ in (24) is $\mathrm{up}[0\ 2]+\mathrm{up}[1\ 3]$. On the other hand, that in (26) is $\max(\mathrm{up}[0\ 1]+\mathrm{up}[2\ 3],\mathrm{up}[1\ 2]+\mathrm{up}[0\ 3])$. They correspond for (20). Thus we have proved Theorem 3.1.

4 Exact Solutions to the Ultradiscrete KP equation

We propose explicit functions which satisfy (18), (19) and (20).

Proposition 4.1 *Define*

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_i(s) = \varphi_i(l,m,n,s) = \max\Big(& p_i s + \max(0,p_i-a_1)l + \max(0,p_i-a_2)m + \max(0,p_i-a_3)n + c_i,\\ & -p_i s + \max(0,-p_i-a_1)l + \max(0,-p_i-a_2)m + \max(0,-p_i-a_3)n + c_i'\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where p_i and c_i, c_i' are arbitrary parameters. Then $\varphi_i(s)$ satisfies (18), (19) and (20).

Proposition 4.1 is proved in [6].

Proposition 4.2 *Define*

$$\begin{bmatrix}\varphi_1(s)\\ \varphi_2(s)\\ \vdots\\ \varphi_N(s)\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}c_{11} & c_{12} & \dots & c_{1M}\\ c_{21} & c_{22} & \dots & c_{2M}\\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots\\ c_{N1} & c_{N2} & \dots & c_{NM}\end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix}\eta_1(l,m,n,s)\\ \eta_2(l,m,n,s)\\ \vdots\\ \eta_M(l,m,n,s)\end{bmatrix}, \tag{28}$$

where

$$\eta_j(l,m,n,s) = p_j s + \max(0,p_j-a_1)l + \max(0,p_j-a_2)m + \max(0,p_j-a_3)n, \tag{29}$$

and c_{ij}, p_j are arbitrary parameters. Then $\varphi_i(s)$ satisfies the conditions (18), (19) for any integer M, and (20) in the case of $M = 1,2,3$.

We shall prove Proposition 4.2. Note (28) is expressed by

$$\varphi_i(l,m,n,s) = \max_{1\le j\le M}\big(c_{ij} + \eta_j(l,m,n,s)\big). \tag{30}$$

Let us check (18) first. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_i(l+1,m,n,s) &= \max_{1\le j\le M}\big(c_{ij} + \eta_j(l+1,m,n,s)\big)\\ &= \max_{1\le j\le M}\big(c_{ij} + \eta_j(l,m,n,s) + \max(0,p_j-a_1)\big)\\ &= \max_{1\le j\le M}\big(\max(c_{ij} + \eta_j(l,m,n,s), c_{ij} + \eta_j(l,m,n,s+1) - a_1)\big)\\ &= \max\big(\max_{1\le j\le M}\big(c_{ij} + \eta_j(l,m,n,s)\big), \max_{1\le j\le M}\big(c_{ij} + \eta_j(l,m,n,s+1) - a_1\big)\big)\\ &= \max(\varphi_i(l,m,n,s), \varphi_i(l,m,n,s+1) - a_1).\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Hence,

$$\varphi_i(l+1,m,n,s) = \max(\varphi_i(l,m,n,s), \varphi_i(l,m,n,s+1) - a_1) \tag{32}$$

holds. The other relations in (18) are also proved by similar manner.

Next we consider (19). We have

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_{i_1}(s) + \varphi_{i_2}(s) &= \max_{1\le j_1\le M}\big(c_{i_1 j_1} + \eta_{j_1}(l,m,n,s)\big) + \max_{1\le j_2\le M}\big(c_{i_2 j_2} + \eta_{j_2}(l,m,n,s)\big)\\ &= \max_{1\le j_1,j_2\le M}\big(c_{i_1 j_1} + c_{i_2 j_2} + \eta_{j_1}(l,m,n,s) + \eta_{j_2}(l,m,n,s)\big).\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max(\varphi_{i_1}(s-1)+\varphi_{i_2}(s+1),\varphi_{i_2}(s-1)+\varphi_{i_1}(s+1))\\
=&\max\Big(\max_{1\le j_1\le M}\big(c_{i_1j_1}+\eta_{j_1}(l,m,n,s)-p_{j_1}\big)+\max_{1\le j_2\le M}\big(c_{i_2j_2}+\eta_{j_2}(l,m,n,s)+p_{j_2}\big),\\
&\quad\max_{1\le j_2\le M}\big(c_{i_2j_2}+\eta_{j_2}(l,m,n,s)-p_{j_2}\big)+\max_{1\le j_1\le M}\big(c_{i_1j_1}+\eta_{j_1}(l,m,n,s)+p_{j_1}\big)\Big)\\
=&\max\Big(\max_{1\le j_1,j_2\le M}\big(c_{i_1j_1}+c_{i_2j_2}+\eta_{j_1}(l,m,n,s)+\eta_{j_2}(l,m,n,s)-p_{j_1}+p_{j_2}\big),\\
&\quad\max_{1\le j_1,j_2\le M}\big(c_{i_1j_1}+c_{i_2j_2}+\eta_{j_1}(l,m,n,s)+\eta_{j_2}(l,m,n,s)+p_{j_1}-p_{j_2}\big)\Big)\\
=&\max_{1\le j_1,j_2\le M}\big(c_{i_1j_1}+c_{i_2j_2}+\eta_{j_1}(l,m,n,s)+\eta_{j_2}(l,m,n,s)+\max(-p_{j_1}+p_{j_2},p_{j_1}-p_{j_2})\big)\\
=&\max_{1\le j_1,j_2\le M}\big(c_{i_1j_1}+c_{i_2j_2}+\eta_{j_1}(l,m,n,s)+\eta_{j_2}(l,m,n,s)+|p_{j_1}-p_{j_2}|\big).
\end{aligned}\tag{34}$$

Thus, (19) also holds.

Finally, let us consider (20). It holds if we prove an inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_2)}\cdots\boldsymbol{\varphi}(N)]+\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_1)}\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_3)}\cdots\boldsymbol{\varphi}(N+1)]\\
\ge&\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_1)}\cdots\boldsymbol{\varphi}(N)]+\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_2)}\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_3)}\cdots\boldsymbol{\varphi}(N+1)]
\end{aligned}\tag{35}$$

since an identity

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max\Big(\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{a}_0\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}_{k_2}}\cdots\boldsymbol{a}_N]+\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{a}_0\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}_{k_1}}\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}_{k_3}}\cdots\boldsymbol{a}_{N+1}]\\
&\qquad\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{a}_0\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}_{k_1}}\cdots\boldsymbol{a}_N]+\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{a}_0\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}_{k_2}}\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}_{k_3}}\cdots\boldsymbol{a}_{N+1}]\Big)\\
=&\max\Big(\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{a}_0\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}_{k_3}}\cdots\boldsymbol{a}_N]+\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{a}_0\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}_{k_1}}\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}_{k_2}}\cdots\boldsymbol{a}_{N+1}]\\
&\qquad\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{a}_0\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}_{k_1}}\cdots\boldsymbol{a}_N]+\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{a}_0\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}_{k_2}}\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}_{k_3}}\cdots\boldsymbol{a}_{N+1}]\Big)
\end{aligned}\tag{36}$$

holds for any integers $0\le k_1<k_2<k_3\le N$ and any N-dimensional vectors $\boldsymbol{a}_j$[6]. For simplicity, we prove (35) in the case of $N=2$, $M=3$ in this section. A proof in the case of general N and $M=1,2,3$ is given in appendix. Set $N=2$, $M=3$, then k_1, k_2, k_3 are determined as 1, 2, 3 uniquely and (35) is reduced into

$$\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)\ \boldsymbol{\varphi}(2)]+\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(1)\ \boldsymbol{\varphi}(3)]\ge\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(1)\ \boldsymbol{\varphi}(2)]+\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)\ \boldsymbol{\varphi}(3)].\tag{37}$$

Note the inequality (35) does not depend on l, m, n, thus we can assume

$$\varphi_i(s)=\max_{1\le j\le 3}(c_{ij}+p_js)\tag{38}$$

without a loss of generality. Then $\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)\ \boldsymbol{\varphi}(2)]$ is expressed by

$$\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)\ \boldsymbol{\varphi}(2)]=\mathrm{up}\left[\begin{bmatrix}c_{11}&c_{12}&c_{13}\\c_{21}&c_{22}&c_{23}\end{bmatrix}\otimes\begin{bmatrix}0&2p_1\\0&2p_2\\0&2p_3\end{bmatrix}\right].$$

We can also assume

$$p_1\le p_2\le p_3.\tag{39}$$

Thus, Using (15) and (39), $\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)\ \boldsymbol{\varphi}(2)]$ can be expanded as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)\ \boldsymbol{\varphi}(2)]=&\max_{1\le i_1\le i_2\le 3}\left(\mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix}c_{1i_1}&c_{1i_2}\\c_{2i_1}&c_{2i_2}\end{bmatrix}+\mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix}0&2p_{i_1}\\0&2p_{i_2}\end{bmatrix}\right)\\
=&\max_{1\le i_1\le i_2\le 3}\big(\mathrm{up}[C_{i_1i_2}]+2p_{i_2}\big)
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_{i_1 i_2}$ denotes

$$C_{i_1 i_2} = \begin{bmatrix} c_{1 i_1} & c_{1 i_2} \\ c_{2 i_1} & c_{2 i_2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

By similar procedure, we obtain

$$\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)\ \boldsymbol{\varphi}(2)] + \mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(1)\ \boldsymbol{\varphi}(3)] = \max_{I,J}\big(\mathrm{up}[C_{i_1 i_2}] + \mathrm{up}[C_{j_1 j_2}] + 2p_{i_2} + p_{j_1} + 3p_{j_2}\big), \tag{40}$$

$$\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(1)\ \boldsymbol{\varphi}(2)] + \mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)\ \boldsymbol{\varphi}(3)] = \max_{I',J'}\big(\mathrm{up}[C_{i'_1 i'_2}] + \mathrm{up}[C_{j'_1 j'_2}] + p_{i'_1} + 2p_{i'_2} + 3p_{j'_2}\big). \tag{41}$$

Here we denote $\max_{1\le i_1\le i_2\le 3, 1\le j_1\le j_2\le 3}$ as $\max_{I,J}$. Hereafter we fix i'_1, i'_2, j'_1, j'_2. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{I,J}\big(\mathrm{up}[C_{i_1 i_2}] + \mathrm{up}[C_{j_1 j_2}] + 2p_{i_2} + p_{j_1} + 3p_{j_2}\big) - (\mathrm{up}[C_{i'_1 i'_2}] + \mathrm{up}[C_{j'_1 j'_2}] + p_{i'_1} + 2p_{i'_2} + 3p_{j'_2}) \\ \ge &\max\big(\mathrm{up}[C_{i'_1 i'_2}] + \mathrm{up}[C_{j'_1 j'_2}] + 2p_{i'_2} + p_{j'_1} + 3p_{j'_2}, \mathrm{up}[C_{j'_1 j'_2}] + \mathrm{up}[C_{i'_1 i'_2}] + 2p_{j'_2} + p_{i'_1} + 3p_{i'_2}\big) \\ &\quad - (\mathrm{up}[C_{i'_1 i'_2}] + \mathrm{up}[C_{j'_1 j'_2}] + p_{i'_1} + 2p_{i'_2} + 3p_{j'_2}) \\ = &\max(p_{j'_1} - p_{i'_1}, -p_{j'_2} + p_{i'_2}). \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

It takes a nonnegative value except in the case of $j'_1 < i'_1 \le i'_2 < j'_2$, namely, $i'_1 = i'_2 = 2$, $j'_1 = 1$, $j'_2 = 3$. When $i'_1 = i'_2 = 2$, $j'_1 = 1$, $j'_2 = 3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{I,J}\big(\mathrm{up}[C_{i_1 i_2}] + \mathrm{up}[C_{j_1 j_2}] + 2p_{i_2} + p_{j_1} + 3p_{j_2}\big) - (\mathrm{up}[C_{22}] + \mathrm{up}[C_{13}] + p_2 + 2p_2 + 3p_3) \\ \ge &\mathrm{up}[C_{12}] + \mathrm{up}[C_{23}] + 2p_2 + p_2 + 3p_3 - (\mathrm{up}[C_{22}] + \mathrm{up}[C_{13}] + p_2 + 2p_2 + 3p_3) \\ = &\mathrm{up}[C_{12}] + \mathrm{up}[C_{23}] - \mathrm{up}[C_{22}] - \mathrm{up}[C_{13}]. \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

It also takes a nonnegative value from Proposition 2.2. Thus, we have proved that (41) is less than or equal to (40). Therefore (20) holds.

Note (37) does not hold when $M \ge 4$. This is because the term which has $\mathrm{up}[C_{23}] + \mathrm{up}[C_{14}]$ in (41) may be greater than (40).

5 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we show the UP defined (17) under the conditions (18), (19), (20) satisfies the uKP equation. It is proved by using some properties of the ultradiscrete permanents. Moreover we give some explicit solutions. We may regard (27) and (28) as the ultradiscrete analogues of (4) and (5). The uKP equation admits the UP solution with (28) in the case of $M \le 3$ although the discrete KP equation does for any M. To clarify these differences is one of the future problems.

Acknowledgement

The author is grateful to Professor Daisuke Takahashi for helpful advice. The author also grateful Keisuke Mizuki for valuable discussions.

A Proof of (15)

In this appendix, we prove Proposition 2.1. From the definition, $\mathrm{up}[B \otimes C]$ is expressed by

$$\mathrm{up}[B \otimes C] = \mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix} \max_{1\le k\le M}(b_{1k} + c_{k1}) & \dots & \max_{1\le k\le M}(b_{1k} + c_{kN}) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \max_{1\le k\le M}(b_{Nk} + c_{k1}) & \dots & \max_{1\le k\le M}(b_{Nk} + c_{kN}) \end{bmatrix}. \tag{44}$$

Applying (12) and (13) to the first column, (44) is expanded as the maximum of M UPs as below.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{up}[B\otimes C] = \max\Bigg(&\mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix} b_{11}+c_{11} & \dots & \max_{1\le k\le M}(b_{1k}+c_{kN}) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_{N1}+c_{11} & \dots & \max_{1\le k\le M}(b_{Nk}+c_{kN}) \end{bmatrix}, \\
&\mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix} b_{12}+c_{21} & \dots & \max_{1\le k\le M}(b_{1k}+c_{kN}) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_{N2}+c_{21} & \dots & \max_{1\le k\le M}(b_{Nk}+c_{kN}) \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix} b_{1M}+c_{M1} & \dots & \max_{1\le k\le M}(b_{1k}+c_{kN}) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_{NM}+c_{M1} & \dots & \max_{1\le k\le M}(b_{Nk}+c_{kN}) \end{bmatrix}\Bigg) \\
= \max_{1\le k_1\le M}\Bigg(&c_{k_1 1} + \mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix} b_{1k_1} & \dots & \max_{1\le k\le M}(b_{1k}+c_{kN}) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_{Nk_1} & \dots & \max_{1\le k\le M}(b_{Nk}+c_{kN}) \end{bmatrix}\Bigg).
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

Applying similar procedure to the other columns, we obtain

$$\mathrm{up}[B\otimes C] = \max_{1\le k_1,k_2,\dots,k_N\le M}\Bigg(\sum_{1\le i\le N} c_{k_i i} + \mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix} b_{1k_1} & \dots & b_{1k_N} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_{Nk_1} & \dots & b_{Nk_N} \end{bmatrix}\Bigg). \tag{46}$$

It is equivalent to

$$\mathrm{up}[B\otimes C] = \max_{1\le j_1\le\dots\le j_N\le M}\left(\max_{\pi'}\left(\sum_{1\le i\le N} c_{\pi'_i i} + \mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix} b_{1\pi'_1} & \dots & b_{1\pi'_N} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_{N\pi'_1} & \dots & b_{N\pi'_N} \end{bmatrix}\right)\right), \tag{47}$$

where $\pi' = (\pi'_1, \pi'_2, \dots, \pi'_N)$ is a set of all possible permutations of $\{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_N\}$. In particular, the UP of the matrix whose columns are exchanged is the same as original one from (11). Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{up}[B\otimes C] &= \max_{1\le j_1\le\dots\le j_N\le M}\left(\max_{\pi'}\sum_{1\le i\le N} c_{\pi'_i i} + \mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix} b_{1j_1} & \dots & b_{1j_N} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_{Nj_1} & \dots & b_{Nj_N} \end{bmatrix}\right) \\
&= \max_{1\le j_1\le\dots\le j_N\le M}\left(\mathrm{up}[C]_{1\dots N}^{j_1\dots j_N} + \mathrm{up}[B]_{j_1\dots j_N}^{1\dots N}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

Thus (15) holds.

B Proof of (16)

In this appendix, we express

$$\boldsymbol{a} = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 \\ a_2 \\ \vdots \\ a_N \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{b} = \begin{bmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \\ \vdots \\ b_N \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{c} = \begin{bmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2 \\ \vdots \\ c_N \end{bmatrix},$$

respectively. Then $\mathrm{up}[D_{l,m,n}] + \mathrm{up}[D_{l',m',n'}]$ is expressed by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{up}[D_{l,m,n}] + \mathrm{up}[D_{l',m',n'}] = \max_{\pi,\pi'}\big(&a_{\pi_1} + \dots + a_{\pi_l} + b_{\pi_{l+1}} + \dots + b_{\pi_{l+m}} + c_{\pi_{l+m+1}} + \dots + c_{\pi_N} \\
&+ a_{\pi'_1} + \dots + a_{\pi'_{l'}} + b_{\pi'_{l'+1}} + \dots + b_{\pi'_{l'+m'}} + c_{\pi'_{l'+m'+1}} + \dots + c_{\pi'_N}\big),
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

namely, $\mathrm{up}[D_{l,m,n}] + \mathrm{up}[D_{l',m',n'}]$ can be expressed by

$$\begin{aligned} &a_{\pi_1} + \cdots + a_{\pi_l} + b_{\pi_{l+1}} + \cdots + b_{\pi_{l+m}} + c_{\pi_{l+m+1}} + \cdots + c_{\pi_N} \\ &+ a_{\pi'_1} + \cdots + a_{\pi'_{l'}} + b_{\pi'_{l'+1}} + \cdots + b_{\pi'_{l'+m'}} + c_{\pi'_{l'+m'+1}} + \cdots + c_{\pi'_N} \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

for certain permutations π and π'. In particular, due to $m > m'$, there exists j such that

$$j \in \{\pi_{l+1}, \pi_{l+2}, \ldots, \pi_{l+m}\} \quad \text{and} \quad j \in \{\pi'_1, \pi'_2, \ldots, \pi'_{l'}\} \cup \{\pi'_{l'+m'+1}, \pi'_{l'+m'+2}, \ldots, \pi'_N\}.$$

First, let us consider in the case there exists j_0 such that

$$j_0 \in \{\pi_{l+1}, \pi_{l+2}, \ldots, \pi_{l+m}\} \quad \text{and} \quad j_0 \in \{\pi'_1, \pi'_2, \ldots, \pi'_{l'}\}. \tag{51}$$

Then $\mathrm{up}[D_{l,m,n}] + \mathrm{up}[D_{l',m',n'}]$ can be expanded as

$$\mathrm{up}[D_{l,m,n}] + \mathrm{up}[D_{l',m',n'}] = \mathrm{up}\left[D_{l,m,n}\begin{bmatrix} j_0 \\ l+1 \end{bmatrix}\right] + b_{j_0} + \mathrm{up}\left[D_{l',m',n'}\begin{bmatrix} j_0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}\right] + a_{j_0} \tag{52}$$

where $D\begin{bmatrix} j \\ k \end{bmatrix}$ denotes the $(N-1)\times(N-1)$ matrix obtained by eliminating the jth row and the kth column from D. On the other hand, $\mathrm{up}[D_{l+1,m-1,n}] + \mathrm{up}[D_{l'-1,m'+1,n'}]$ can be evaluated as

$$\mathrm{up}[D_{l+1,m-1,n}] + \mathrm{up}[D_{l'-1,m'+1,n'}] \geq \mathrm{up}\left[D_{l+1,m-1,n}\begin{bmatrix} j_0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}\right] + a_{j_0} + \mathrm{up}\left[D_{l'-1,m'+1,n'}\begin{bmatrix} j_0 \\ l' \end{bmatrix}\right] + b_{j_0}. \tag{53}$$

From (52) and (53), we obtain $\mathrm{up}[D_{l+1,m-1,n}] + \mathrm{up}[D_{l'-1,m'+1,n'}] \geq \mathrm{up}[D_{l,m,n}] + \mathrm{up}[D_{l',m',n'}]$ since

$$\mathrm{up}\left[D_{l,m,n}\begin{bmatrix} j_0 \\ l+1 \end{bmatrix}\right] = \mathrm{up}\left[D_{l+1,m-1,n}\begin{bmatrix} j_0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}\right], \quad \mathrm{up}\left[D_{l',m',n'}\begin{bmatrix} j_0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}\right] = \mathrm{up}\left[D_{l'-1,m'+1,n'}\begin{bmatrix} j_0 \\ l' \end{bmatrix}\right] \tag{54}$$

hold.

Next we consider the case there is no j_0 such that (51). Then there exists j_1 such that

$$j_1 \in \{\pi_{l+1}, \pi_{l+2}, \ldots, \pi_{l+m}\} \quad \text{and} \quad j_1 \in \{\pi'_{l'+m'+1}, \pi'_{l'+m'+2}, \ldots, \pi'_N\}.$$

In addition, due to $l < l'$, there also exists j_2 such that

$$j_2 \in \{\pi_{l+m+1}, \pi_{l+m+2}, \ldots, \pi_N\} \quad \text{and} \quad j_2 \in \{\pi'_1, \pi'_2, \ldots, \pi'_{l'}\}.$$

Thus, $\mathrm{up}[D_{l,m,n}] + \mathrm{up}[D_{l',m',n'}]$ can be expanded as

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{up}[D_{l,m,n}] + \mathrm{up}[D_{l',m',n'}] \\ =&\mathrm{up}\left[D_{l,m,n}\begin{bmatrix} j_1 & j_2 \\ l+1 & l+m+1 \end{bmatrix}\right] + b_{j_1} + c_{j_2} + \mathrm{up}\left[D_{l',m',n'}\begin{bmatrix} j_1 & j_2 \\ l'+m'+1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}\right] + c_{j_1} + a_{j_2}. \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

On the other hand $\mathrm{up}[D_{l+1,m-1,n}] + \mathrm{up}[D_{l'-1,m'+1,n'}]$ can be evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{up}[D_{l+1,m-1,n}] + \mathrm{up}[D_{l'-1,m'+1,n'}] \\ \geq&\mathrm{up}\left[D_{l+1,m-1,n}\begin{bmatrix} j_1 & j_2 \\ l+m+1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}\right] + c_{j_1} + a_{j_2} + \mathrm{up}\left[D_{l'-1,m'+1,n'}\begin{bmatrix} j_1 & j_2 \\ l' & l'+m'+1 \end{bmatrix}\right] + b_{j_1} + c_{j_2}. \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

From (55) and (56), we obtain $\mathrm{up}[D_{l+1,m-1,n}] + \mathrm{up}[D_{l'-1,m'+1,n'}] \geq \mathrm{up}[D_{l,m,n}] + \mathrm{up}[D_{l',m',n'}]$ since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{up}\left[D_{l,m,n}\begin{bmatrix} j_1 & j_2 \\ l+1 & l+m+1 \end{bmatrix}\right] &= \mathrm{up}\left[D_{l+1,m-1,n}\begin{bmatrix} j_1 & j_2 \\ l+m+1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}\right], \\ \mathrm{up}\left[D_{l',m',n'}\begin{bmatrix} j_1 & j_2 \\ l'+m'+1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}\right] &= \mathrm{up}\left[D_{l'-1,m'+1,n'}\begin{bmatrix} j_1 & j_2 \\ l' & l'+m'+1 \end{bmatrix}\right] \end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

hold.

C Proof of (35)

We prove (35) in the case of $M = 1, 2, 3$ and any integer N. We can assume

$$\varphi_i(s) = \max_{1\le j\le M}(c_{ij} + p_j s) \tag{58}$$

and

$$p_1 \le p_2 \le \cdots \le p_M \tag{59}$$

without a loss of generality. One can prove (35) in the case of $M = 1$. In the case of $M = 2$, by adding $-\sum_{i=1}^N (c_{i1} + c_{i2}) - \sum_{i=1}^N (p_1 + p_2)i - \frac{(p_1+p_2)(N+1-k_1-k_2-k_3)}{2}$ to (35), it is reduced into the inequality proved in [6] since each $\varphi_i(s)$ can be rewritten as

$$\varphi_i(s) - \frac{c_{i1} + c_{i2} + p_1 s + p_2 s}{2} = \frac{1}{2}|c_{i1} - c_{i2} + (p_1 - p_2)s|.$$

Thus (35) holds.

We consider in the case of $M = 3$. Using (15), $\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_2)}\cdots\boldsymbol{\varphi}(N)]$ can be expanded as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_2)}\cdots\boldsymbol{\varphi}(N)]\\
=&\mathrm{up}\left[\begin{bmatrix} c_{11} & c_{12} & c_{13}\\ c_{21} & c_{22} & c_{23}\\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots\\ c_{N1} & c_{N2} & c_{N3}\end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 & p_1 & 2p_1 & \dots & \widehat{k_2p_1} & \dots & Np_1\\ 0 & p_2 & 2p_2 & \dots & \widehat{k_2p_2} & \dots & Np_2\\ 0 & p_3 & 2p_3 & \dots & \widehat{k_2p_3} & \dots & Np_3\end{bmatrix}\right]\\
=&\max_{1\le i_1\le\cdots\le i_N\le 3}\left(\mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix} c_{1i_1} & c_{1i_2} & \dots & c_{1i_N}\\ c_{2i_1} & c_{2i_2} & \dots & c_{2i_N}\\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots\\ c_{Ni_1} & c_{Ni_2} & \dots & c_{Ni_N}\end{bmatrix} + \mathrm{up}\begin{bmatrix} 0 & p_{i_1} & 2p_{i_1} & \dots & \widehat{k_2p_{i_1}} & \dots & Np_{i_1}\\ 0 & p_{i_2} & 2p_{i_2} & \dots & \widehat{k_2p_{i_2}} & \dots & Np_{i_2}\\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots\\ 0 & p_{i_N} & 2p_{i_N} & \dots & \widehat{k_2p_{i_N}} & \dots & Np_{i_N}\end{bmatrix}\right)\\
=&\max_{1\le i_1\le\cdots\le i_N\le 3}\left(\mathrm{up}[C_{i_1i_2\dots i_N}] + \sum_{l=1}^{k_2}(l-1)p_{i_l} + \sum_{l=k_2+1}^{N} lp_{i_l}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_{i_1i_2\dots i_N}$ denotes

$$C_{i_1i_2\dots i_N} = \begin{bmatrix} c_{1i_1} & c_{1i_2} & \dots & c_{1i_N}\\ c_{2i_1} & c_{2i_2} & \dots & c_{2i_N}\\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots\\ c_{Ni_1} & c_{Ni_2} & \dots & c_{Ni_N}\end{bmatrix}.$$

By similar procedure, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_2)}\cdots\boldsymbol{\varphi}(N)] + \mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_1)}\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_3)}\cdots\boldsymbol{\varphi}(N+1)]\\
=&\max_{I,J}\Big(\mathrm{up}[C_{i_1i_2\dots i_N}] + \mathrm{up}[C_{j_1j_2\dots j_N}] + \sum_{l=1}^{N} lp_{i_l} + \sum_{l=1}^{N} lp_{j_l} - \sum_{l=1}^{k_2} p_{i_l} - \sum_{l=1}^{k_1} p_{j_l} + \sum_{l=k_3}^{N} p_{j_l}\Big),
\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_1)}\cdots\boldsymbol{\varphi}(N)] + \mathrm{up}[\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_2)}\cdots\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(k_3)}\cdots\boldsymbol{\varphi}(N+1)]\\
=&\max_{I',J'}\Big(\mathrm{up}[C_{i'_1i'_2\dots i'_N}] + \mathrm{up}[C_{j'_1j'_2\dots j'_N}] + \sum_{l=1}^{N} lp_{i'_l} + \sum_{l=1}^{N} lp_{j'_l} - \sum_{l=1}^{k_1} p_{i'_l} - \sum_{l=1}^{k_2} p_{j'_l} + \sum_{l=k_3}^{N} p_{j'_l}\Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

Here we denote $\max_{1\le i_1\le\cdots\le i_N\le 3,1\le j_1\le\cdots\le j_N\le 3}$ as $\max_{I,J}$ and $\sum_{l=m}^{n}$ is defined as 0 when $m>n$. Let us consider the argument of (61):

$$\mathrm{up}[C_{i'_1 i'_2\ldots i'_N}]+\mathrm{up}[C_{j'_1 j'_2\ldots j'_N}]+\sum_{l=1}^{N} lp_{i'_l}+\sum_{l=1}^{N} lp_{j'_l}-\sum_{l=1}^{k_1} p_{i'_l}-\sum_{l=1}^{k_2} p_{j'_l}+\sum_{l=k_3}^{N} p_{j'_l}. \tag{62}$$

Our purpose is archived if we show (62) is less than or equal to (60) for any $i'_1, i'_2, \ldots i'_N, j'_1, j'_2, \ldots, j'_N$. Hereafter we fix $i'_1, i'_2, \ldots i'_N, j'_1, j'_2, \ldots, j'_N$. First we compare (62) and the arguments (60) associated with $i_l = i'_l$, $j_i = j'_l$ or $i_l = j'_l$, $j_i = i'_l$. Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{I,J}\Big(\mathrm{up}[C_{i_1 i_2\ldots i_N}]+\mathrm{up}[C_{j_1 j_2\ldots j_N}]+\sum_{l=1}^{N} lp_{i_l}+\sum_{l=1}^{N} lp_{j_l}-\sum_{l=1}^{k_2} p_{i_l}-\sum_{l=1}^{k_1} p_{j_l}+\sum_{l=k_3}^{N} p_{j_l}\Big)\\
&-\left(\mathrm{up}[C_{i'_1 i'_2\ldots i'_N}]+\mathrm{up}[C_{j'_1 j'_2\ldots j'_N}]+\sum_{l=1}^{N} lp_{i'_l}+\sum_{l=1}^{N} lp_{j'_l}-\sum_{l=1}^{k_1} p_{i'_l}-\sum_{l=1}^{k_2} p_{j'_l}+\sum_{l=k_3}^{N} p_{j'_l}\right)\\
&\ge\max\Big(\mathrm{up}[C_{i'_1 i'_2\ldots i'_N}]+\mathrm{up}[C_{j'_1 j'_2\ldots j'_N}]+\sum_{l=1}^{N} lp_{i'_l}+\sum_{l=1}^{N} lp_{j'_l}-\sum_{l=1}^{k_2} p_{i'_l}-\sum_{l=1}^{k_1} p_{j'_l}+\sum_{l=k_3}^{N} p_{j'_l},\\
&\quad\mathrm{up}[C_{j'_1 j'_2\ldots j'_N}]+\mathrm{up}[C_{i'_1 i'_2\ldots i'_N}]+\sum_{l=1}^{N} lp_{j'_l}+\sum_{l=1}^{N} lp_{i'_l}-\sum_{l=1}^{k_2} p_{j'_l}-\sum_{l=1}^{k_1} p_{i'_l}+\sum_{l=k_3}^{N} p_{i'_l}\Big)\\
&-\left(\mathrm{up}[C_{i'_1 i'_2\ldots i'_N}]+\mathrm{up}[C_{j'_1 j'_2\ldots j'_N}]+\sum_{l=1}^{N} lp_{i'_l}+\sum_{l=1}^{N} lp_{j'_l}-\sum_{l=1}^{k_1} p_{i'_l}-\sum_{l=1}^{k_2} p_{j'_l}+\sum_{l=k_3}^{N} p_{j'_l}\right)\\
&=\max\Big(\sum_{l=k_1+1}^{k_2}(-p_{i'_l}+p_{j'_l}),\quad\sum_{l=k_3}^{N}(p_{i'_l}-p_{j'_l})\Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

It takes a nonnegative value when

$$\sum_{l=k_1+1}^{k_2}(-p_{i'_l}+p_{j'_l})\ge 0\quad\text{or}\quad\sum_{l=k_3}^{N}(p_{i'_l}-p_{j'_l})\ge 0 \tag{64}$$

holds for any $0\le k_1<k_2<k_3\le N$. Next let us compare (62) and (60) in the case

$$\sum_{l=k_1+1}^{k_2}(-p_{i'_l}+p_{j'_l})<0\quad\text{and}\quad\sum_{l=k_3}^{N}(p_{i'_l}-p_{j'_l})<0 \tag{65}$$

hold for certain k_1, k_2 and k_3. We introduce the notations

$$i'_l=\begin{cases}1 & (l=1,2,\ldots,\alpha)\\ 2 & (l=\alpha+1,\alpha+2,\ldots,\beta)\\ 3 & (l=\beta+1,\beta+2,\ldots,N)\end{cases},\qquad j'_l=\begin{cases}1 & (l=1,2,\ldots,\gamma)\\ 2 & (l=\gamma+1,\gamma+2,\ldots,\delta)\\ 3 & (l=\delta+1,\delta+2,\ldots,N)\end{cases}. \tag{66}$$

Note that α, β, γ, δ should be $k_1+1\le\alpha\le k_2<k_3\le\beta\le N$ and $\alpha<\gamma<\delta<\beta$ in order to hold (65). In addition it should be $i'_{k_2}=i'_{k_3}=2$, $j'_{k_1+1}=1$, $j'_N=3$, $j'_\alpha=1$ and $j'_\beta=3$ (See Table 1). For these i'_l and j'_l, we set i_l and j_l as

$$i_l=\begin{cases}1 & (l=1,2,\ldots,\alpha+1)\\ 2 & (l=\alpha+2,\alpha+3,\ldots,\beta)\\ 3 & (l=\beta+1,\beta+2,\ldots,N)\end{cases},\qquad j_l=\begin{cases}1 & (l=1,2,\ldots,\gamma-1)\\ 2 & (l=\gamma,\gamma+1,\ldots,\delta)\\ 3 & (l=\delta+1,\delta+2,\ldots,N)\end{cases}. \tag{67}$$

l	1	$\dots$	α	$\alpha+1$	$\alpha+2$	$\dots$	$\gamma-1$	γ	$\gamma+1$	$\dots$	δ	$\delta+1$	$\dots$	β	$\beta+1$	$\dots$	N
i'_l	1	$\dots$	1	2	2	$\dots$	2	2	2	$\dots$	2	2	$\dots$	2	3	$\dots$	3
i_l	1	$\dots$	1	1	2	$\dots$	2	2	2	$\dots$	2	2	$\dots$	2	3	$\dots$	3
j'_l	1	$\dots$	1	1	1	$\dots$	1	1	2	$\dots$	2	3	$\dots$	3	3	$\dots$	3
j_l	1	$\dots$	1	1	1	$\dots$	1	2	2	$\dots$	2	3	$\dots$	3	3	$\dots$	3

Table 1: The sets of i_l, j_l, i'_l, j'_l for (66) and (67)

Subtracting (62) associated with (66) from the argument of (60) associated with (67), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{up}[C_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N}] + \mathrm{up}[C_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_N}] + \sum_{l=1}^{N} lp_{i_l} + \sum_{l=1}^{N} lp_{j_l} - \sum_{l=1}^{k_2} p_{i_l} - \sum_{l=1}^{k_1} p_{j_l} + \sum_{l=k_3}^{N} p_{j_l} \\
&- \left(\mathrm{up}[C_{i'_1 i'_2 \dots i'_N}] + \mathrm{up}[C_{j'_1 j'_2 \dots j'_N}] + \sum_{l=1}^{N} lp_{i'_l} + \sum_{l=1}^{N} lp_{j'_l} - \sum_{l=1}^{k_1} p_{i'_l} - \sum_{l=1}^{k_2} p_{j'_l} + \sum_{l=k_3}^{N} p_{j'_l} \right) \\
&= \mathrm{up}[C_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N}] + \mathrm{up}[C_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_N}] - \mathrm{up}[C_{i'_1 i'_2 \dots i'_N}] - \mathrm{up}[C_{j'_1 j'_2 \dots j'_N}] \\
&+ (\gamma - \alpha - 1)(p_2 - p_1) - \sum_{l=k_1+1}^{k_2} (p_{i_l} - p_{j'_l}) + \sum_{l=k_3}^{N} (p_{j_l} - p_{j'_l}) \qquad (68) \\
&\geq \mathrm{up}[C_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N}] + \mathrm{up}[C_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_N}] - \mathrm{up}[C_{i'_1 i'_2 \dots i'_N}] - \mathrm{up}[C_{j'_1 j'_2 \dots j'_N}] \\
&\quad + (\gamma - \alpha - 1)(p_2 - p_1) - (\gamma - \alpha - 1)(p_2 - p_1) + \sum_{l=k_3}^{N} (p_{j_l} - p_{j'_l}) \\
&= \mathrm{up}[C_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N}] + \mathrm{up}[C_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_N}] - \mathrm{up}[C_{i'_1 i'_2 \dots i'_N}] - \mathrm{up}[C_{j'_1 j'_2 \dots j'_N}] + \sum_{l=k_3}^{N} (p_{j_l} - p_{j'_l})
\end{aligned}
$$

It takes a nonnegative value from Proposition 2.2. Therefore (35) holds.

References

[1] R. Hirota: Discrete analogue of a generalized Toda equation, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **50** (1981) 3785–91.

[2] T. Miwa: On Hirota's difference equations, Proc. Jpn. Acad. **58** (1982) 9–12.

[3] Y. Ohta, R. Hirota, S. Tsujimoto and T. Imai: Casorati and discrete Gram type determinant representations of solutions to the discrete KP hierarchy, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **62** (1993) 1872–1886.

[4] T. Tokihiro, D. Takahashi, J. Matsukidaira and J. Satsuma: From Soliton Equations to Integrable Cellular Automata through a Limiting Procedure, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76** (1996) 3247–3250.

[5] D. Takahashi, R. Hirota: Ultradiscrete Soliton Solution of Permanent Type, J. Phys. Soc. Japan, **76** (2007) 104007–104012.

[6] H. Nagai and D. Takahashi: Ultradiscrete Plücker Relation Specialized for Soliton Solutions, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **44** (2011) 095202(18pp).

[7] H. Nagai: A new expression of a soliton solution to the ultradiscrete Toda equation, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **41** (2008) 235204(12pp).

[8] S. Nakamura: A periodic phase soliton of the ultradiscrete hungry Lotka-Volterra equation J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **42** (2009) 495204(10pp)